

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 have been amended to present the claims in better form for allowance and for possible consideration on appeal. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to accept the proposed amendments. Claims 6-11, 15-22 and 26-33 were previously cancelled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-5, 12-14, 23-25 and 34-36 are now presented for examination.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowan et al., StackGuard (“Cowan”) in view of Koopman.

Applicants respectfully submit that Koopman does not disclose or reasonably suggest the deficiencies of Cowan. For example, as referenced by the Examiner, Cowan does not disclose or reasonably suggest removing one or more plurality of empty places as recited by claim 1 (see Office Action, mailed 3/14/2005, page 3, first paragraph). Similarly, Cowan does not disclose or reasonably suggest “removing one or more of the plurality of empty spaces from the known place on the stack where they were previously placed to find the return address” as recited by claim 1, as amended (emphasis provided).

Koopman discloses the well-known “Last-In-First-Out” (LIFO) technique for *removing “trays”* from a stack by pushing and popping to fill and empty the stack, respectively (pages 1-2, fig. 1). Koopman further discloses the removal of the trays using the LIFO technique being “a spring-loaded tray dispenser of the type often found in cafeterias” (page 1, section 1.2.1). Koopman’s well-known LIFO technique for removing

trays is not the same as removing one or more of the plurality of empty spaces from the known place on the stack where they were previously placed to find the return address, as recited by claim 1. Hence, Koopman adds nothing relevant to Cowan at least with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12, 23 and 34 and their dependent claims.

Claims 2-4, 13-14, 24-25 and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Cowan and Koopman and further in view of Kettlewell.

Claim 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Cowan and Koopman and further in view of Menezes et al., Handbook of Applied Cryptography (“Menezes”).

Claims 2-4, 5, 13-14, 24-25 and 35-36 depend from one of claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 and thus include all the limitations of the claim from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4, 5, 13-14, 24-25 and 35-36.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

**Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

**Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: April 6, 2005



Aslam A. Jaffery  
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980